

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Un	ited States of America,	Case No. CR 10 - Cr - 13	1- (EH
	Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUNDER THE SPEEDY TRIA	
Fei	nando Lugo Garcia Defendant.		
Speedy Tri	isons stated by the parties on the record on Aial Act from Aial Act from 7, 2016 to 7, 2016 to 10 (A). The Court makes this finding and bases	, 2016 and finds that the defendant in a speedy to	ne ends of justice served rial. See 18 U.S.C. §
	Failure to grant a continuance would be l See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ikely to result in a miscarriage of j	ustice.
(4)	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).		
	Failure to grant a continuance would den taking into account the exercise of due di	The same and the s	
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
V	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
	IC CO ODDEDED		-
	IS SO ORDERED.	A 111	APR 07 2016
DA	TED: 4-7-16	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judg	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ST	IPULATED: Attament for Defendant	Part of the	
	Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorn	iev